

Information structure and grammaticalization. Discourse markers and utterance position in Catalan and German

Ferran Robles i Sabater (València / Basel)

Summary: This paper explores the relation between the position of discourse markers and the instructions they provide on the information structure of utterances. We assume that, next to other types of indications, discourse markers encode during their grammaticalization process instructions about the informative status of the discourse constituents on which they operate and about their relevance for text progression. Our aim is to account for these indications and show the benefits of using a model of discourse units for the description of markers. For this purpose, we will adopt the Basel model for discourse segmentation, which regards text as a pragmatic unit consisting of hierarchically organized information units. The study concludes that metalinguistic operations such as reformulation in written language can be better explained on the grounds of the dynamics governing text construction and organization.

Keywords: Discourse markers, grammaticalization, information structure, reformulation, argumentation, relevance ■

■ 1 Introduction¹

The grammaticalization of discourse markers (henceforth, DM) is commonly defined as a process by means of which a lexical unit or construction gradually loses the characteristics that define its class and adopts others that are typical for grammatical categories (Brinton, 1996; Auer / Günthner, 2005; Estellés, 2011). This transit from lexical to grammatical meaning goes along with a set of modifications in the form, inner structure, and semantic content of the unit.

Most studies devoted to the grammaticalization of DMs focus on aspects such as the substitution of their conceptual meaning by procedural meaning, their loss of inflectional and distributional potential, their trans-

1 Research founding was provided by the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad (Project FFI2013-45769-P: *Combinaciones fraseológicas del alemán de estructura [prep. + sust.]*).



phrastic metadiscursive functions or their prosodic behavior. Far less attention has been paid to such a crucial feature as to how a DM can influence the way in which propositional content is hierarchized and distributed in utterances. In this work, we adopt Ferrari & Borreguero's (2015: 40) understanding of texts as pragmatic units consisting of a set of communication units characterized by a particular meaning and a specific and complex organization. From this perspective, information packaging (in the sense of Chafe [1976] and Krifka / Musan [2012]) cannot be seen as a secondary aspect of the description of DMs, but as one of the main reasons for their presence in texts. Our hypothesis is that the meaning of a DM can encode, next to other kinds of instructions, specific indications about the informative relevance of the discourse segments on which it operates, about the sort of information produced, and about the way in which these segments interact with those preceding or succeeding them in speech (cf. Portolés, 2007: 120ss).

The aim of this paper is to account for these instructions, which DMs acquire along their grammaticalization process (Lehmann, 2008: 207). For this, two markers will be analyzed: *das heißt* and *és a dir*, i.e. the prototypical reformulation markers (henceforth, RM) of German and Catalan. Reformulation tends to be explained on the grounds of its function as a self-repair mechanism in spoken language. However, in written discourse it cannot merely be regarded as an operation “that allows speakers to go back to their first formulation – or that of other participants – and to reinterpret it or some aspect of it, in terms of what the speaker said [...], meant to say or [...] implied” (Del Saz, 2007: 82; cf. Garcés, 2008: 69).² Our corpus is made up of the occurrences of these RMs in DereKo and CTILC. We will argue that reformulation is an information packaging mechanism through which a speaker distributes the propositional content of his utterances and organizes it hierarchically into two informative levels. For this, we will resort to the Basel model for discourse unit segmentation (Ferrari, 2014; Ferrari / Borreguero, 2015), which analyses both the communication units of which paragraphs (and, therefore, texts) are made up and their articulation into a set of information units that group together and hierarchize the semantic content of the communication unit.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 defines DMs as extra-propositional units and outlines their relation to utterance syntax. Section 3

2 For a summary description of reformulation operations and their markers in German and Catalan, see Robles (2012; 2016), Breindl *et al.* (2014: 1131–1167), Bach (2017).

examines the notions of sentence position and utterance position and shows the benefits of applying the latter to a better description of DMs based on the analysis of the information units of which the text is composed, and not so much of the grammatical units in which it is encoded (Halliday / Hasan, 1976: 2). Section 4 presents the Basel model for discourse segmentation and adapts it to the study of *das heißt* and *és a dir* for the purpose of this work. Conclusions are drawn in section 5.

■ 2 DMs and utterance syntax

According to Portolés (2007: 25–26), DMs are

unidades lingüísticas invariables, [que] no ejercen una función sintáctica en el marco de la predicación oracional y poseen un cometido coincidente en el discurso: el de guiar, de acuerdo con sus distintas propiedades morfosintácticas, semánticas y pragmáticas, las inferencias que se realizan en la comunicación.

From a semantico-pragmatic perspective, Onea & Volodina complete this characterization of DMs by stating that

Es ist bekannt, dass Diskurspartikeln [...] nichts oder ganz wenig zum propositionalen Inhalt von Sätzen beitragen, sondern eher auf der Ebene der sogenannten projektiven Bedeutung (*projective meaning*) operieren, die expressive Bedeutung, Präsuppositionen, konventionelle Implikaturen etc. zusammenfasst. (Onea / Volodina, 2009: 292)

In line with these definitions, DMs must first of all be identified as elements that operate beyond the limits of sentence syntax and semantics (“hinter der Grenze”, according to Dalmas, 1993: 205) and specify relations that correspond to the macrostructure of texts, such as connexion, modalization and metadiscursive instructions. Words and phrases belonging to this category are not subject to the valency or dependency relations that are characteristic of sentence syntax (Martín Zorraquino / Portolés, 1999: 4057; Pasch *et al.*, 2003: 331–332; Imo, 2012: 51). Nor does their meaning contribute to the truth-conditions of the propositions expressed by the utterance hosting them (Brinton, 1996: 34; Fraser, 1996: 167; Del Saz, 2007: 68). Their presence in texts cannot be explained on the grounds of sentence grammar, since their meaning is of a different kind: “der semantische Beitrag von Diskurspartikeln stellt Anforderungen an den Kontext oder kodiert Informationen über die Einstellung des Sprechers zu seiner Aussage” (Onea / Volodina, 2009: 292).

Therefore, DMs are commonly said to operate in the margins of sentence relations (Martín Zorraquino / Portolés, 1999: 4057). Indeed, the “extrapositional condition” of DMs (Llamas, 2010: 189ss) is one of their most outstanding features and results in varying degrees of syntactic mobility (Cuenca, 2006: 59; 2017: 114; Llamas, 2010: 189; Wöllstein, 2010: 70–71; Imo, 2012: 48; Breindl *et al.*, 2014: 1133–1134). Actually, the positional freedom that is typical of most DMs is due to two factors: on the one hand, to their parenthetical character, which in written discourse reveals through the use of graphic pauses (which, in turn, evince their independence from sentence relations). And, on the other hand, to the lexical or phrasal category in which each DM originated, since quite often “la libertad posicional de estos marcadores está restringida por el estatuto categorial al que estos elementos pertenecían originalmente” (Llamas, 2010: 199).³ Irrespective of that, neither the parenthetical condition nor the great positional mobility of DMs are necessary conditions for their definition as a class (Cuenca, 2006; Montolío, 2008; Llamas, 2010) nor explain their frequent use in texts.

The position of DMs has also played an important role for the definition of this category in German. The sentence topology in German main clauses involves a bracket structure that essentially realizes multi-part predicate expressions discontinuously, thus forming a bracket around the main content of the utterance (Diedrichsen, 2017: 44). In this way, three fields (or positions) can be identified: *Vorfeld* (pre-field), *Mittelfeld* (middle field) and *Nachfeld* (post-field) (Altmann / Hofmann, 2008; Wöllstein, 2010). The syntactic bracket opens with the second element in the sentence, which is characteristically a finite verb. In front of it a single syntactic member can be placed. However, there are a number of words and constructions that can appear before the sentence-initial element, that is to say, in the *Vor-Vorfeld* of the utterance (Thim-Mabrey, 1988; Auer, 1997; Imo, 2012). All these elements share two defining features: on the one hand, they operate at a level other than the sentence and, therefore, are not subject to its syntactic or semantic restrictions; on the other hand, they do not contribute to the propositional meaning of the utterance which hosts

3 It cannot be ignored that all DMs have originated in grammatical units already existing in the language, which acquired at a given point in time the capacity to operate beyond the utterance limits: “Nos hallamos ante entidades que son susceptibles de funcionar dentro de los límites de la oración y que, tras sufrir modificaciones que afectan a su morfología, a su distribución sintáctica y a su contenido, pueden operar en un marco trans- o extraoracional” (Martín Zorraquino, 1994: 710).

them, but convey metadiscursive instructions. As posed by Thim-Mabrey (1988: 53),

Das Auftreten im sprachlichen Vor-Vorfeld ist selbst als sprachliches Mittel der expliziten Metakommunikation zu werten, wenn es für einen Ausdruck mehrere Stellungs-möglichkeiten im Satz gibt.

Auer (1997) redefines the sense in which Thim-Mabrey's explicit meta-communication must be understood:

Als Funktion von Vor-Vorfeldausdrücken wird in der Literatur oft die "explizite Meta-kommunikation" genannt: der Ausdruck im Vor-Vorfeld gebe dem Hörer Anweisungen, wie er die folgende Äußerung verstehen soll [...] Diese metakommunikative Funktion ist bei textbezogener (v.a. textverknüpfender) Verwendung von Vor-Vorfeldadverbialien auch in den hier untersuchten mündlichen Materialien deutlich erkennbar [...] Die Vor-Vorfeldkonstituenten dienen hier dazu deutlich zu machen, welche Position oder Funktion die Äußerung, die sie einleiten, in einer größeren Texteinheit hat. So wird in Ausschnitt (9) durch *nämlich* eine Erläuterung, in Ausschnitt (10) durch *außerdem* und in Ausschnitt (11) durch *dann* ein nächster Schritt in einer Liste/Aufzählung angekündigt. (Auer, 1997: 59)

In order to explain the position of these elements, Zifonun *et al.* (1997: 1502–1504) and Averintseva (2007: 141–142) have postulated the existence of an external field (or *Außenfeld*) in German utterances that surrounds the sentence core structure. Both left and right margins of the utterance differ from the pre-field and post-field positions, since they cannot host syntactic members subject to dependency relations.⁴ They rather convey procedural instructions that contribute to text construction and articulation: "In Sprache-in-Interaktion werden die Satzränder systematisch als Ort benutzt, um dort gesprächsorganisierende Einheiten zu platzieren" (Imo, 2012: 50).⁵

The external field of the German utterance is made up of a left margin (*linkes Außenfeld* or *Vor-Vorfeld*) and a right margin (*rechtes Außenfeld*, often equated to the notion of appendix or *Nachtrag*). Thim-Mabrey (1988: 55–56) was the first to produce a tentative list of words, phrases, and fragments able to occupy the sentence-initial position while fulfilling meta-

4 According to Averintseva (2007: 141), "diese [zwei Außenfelder] sind für Elemente vorgesehen, die syntaktisch keine Teile des Satzes im eigentlichen Sinne sind, während Vor- und Nachfeld echte Satzteile (d.h. Komplemente oder Adjunkte) aufnehmen, die aus bestimmten Gründen nicht auf ihrer Basisposition im Mittelfeld stehen".

5 Cf. Martín Zorraquino (1994: 710), Selting (1994: 316), Llamas (2010: 194), Schwitalla (2012: 110).

communicative functions (cf. Meyer-Hermann, 1976: 84). As to the right margin, Altmann (1981) made the first thorough study of the mechanisms involved in the placement of syntactic members beyond the sentence bracket (both in the post-field and the right external field). Among them, one is especially relevant for the comprehension of DMs: the appendix or *Nachtrag*. Elements (phrases and clauses) placed in the *Nachtrag* position are characterized by their syntactic autonomy. They have the status of elliptical utterances and quite often their own illocutionary force. In written language, the appendix is separated from the sentence by a comma and is frequently preceded by a pragmatic marker such as *sogar*, *insbesondere*, *vor allem* or the RM *und zwar*. A major difference between the use of an appendix and the right dislocation (or *Rechtsversetzung*) concerns the kind of information rendered by the utterance. In the right dislocation, “a referential constituent which could function as an argument or an adjunct within a predicate-argument structure occurs instead outside the boundaries of the clause containing the predicate” (Lambrecht, 2001: 1050). Therefore, it does not contribute to the utterance with new meaning or referential constituents (i.e. it is thematic). Instead, an appendix provides new information (i.e. it is rhematic) and, consequently, contributes to text progression. It allows the speaker to connect, distribute, and organize topics and comments in discourse (Rath, 1979: 185–189).⁶

RMs such as *nämlich* and *és a dir* can be used as topic-comment organizers in this way. They help to sequence given and new information,⁷ inasmuch as they introduce a referential constituent, which is specified herein-after (cf. Auer, 2006: 288; Imo, 2013: 80; Breindl *et al.*, 2014: 1155s).

- (1) Alle Kreditinstitute mit einer österreichischen Bankkonzession gehören einem der fünf Fachverbände der Kreditwirtschaft an, *nämlich* Raiffeisenbank, Sparkassen, Banken und Bankiers, Volksbanken oder Hypo-Banken. (*Die Presse* 02.07.2015)

6 The appendix as the space in which German DMs fulfill their communicative function has been studied by Dalmás (1993), Vinckel (2006), Averintseva (2009), Onea / Volodina (2009), Schwitalla (2012: 114–115) and Breindl *et al.* (2014: 31–32), among others. All of them refer to the rhematic, parenthetical and foregrounding character of the discourse members placed in this position (cf. Wöllstein 2010: 73).

7 In the sense of Finegan (2015: 271): “Given information is information currently in the forefront of an addressee’s mind; new information is information just being introduced into the discourse”.

- (2) Røthlisberger va destacar especialment els noms dels sancionats amb targetes, *és a dir*, Urbano, Víctor, Schuster i Moratalla, com els més conflictius. (*Diari de Barcelona* 1987)

■ 3 DMs and utterance position

It is generally acknowledged that most DMs occupy the position in front of the discourse member on which they operate (cf. Brinton, 1996: 33; Gohl / Günthner, 1999: 59–60; Fiehler, 2004: 271ss; Imo, 2012: 51) or stay between the discourse members they link (Cuenca, 2006: 59; Llamas, 2010: 189; cf. Pasch *et al.*, 2003: 351ss). However, it would be hasty to conclude that there is a prototypical place for DMs inside the utterance, since “cuanto más individualizado se hace el estudio de los marcadores, la supuesta ‘versatilidad’ o ‘movilidad’ distribucional de éstos queda más en entredicho” (Martín Zorraquino, 2008: 44; cf. Brinton, 1996: 33; Del Sz, 2007: 91).

In current studies, three positions are designated for DMs: an initial (i.e. at the beginning of the utterance), an integrated in the utterance and a final position (Del Sz, 2007; Martín Zorraquino, 2008: 41–42; De Cesare / Borreguero, 2014: 57–58; Montañez, 2015). In this way, authors identify DMs that must appear before their scopes and distinguish them from those that only show a tendency to occupy this position but can take others inside the utterance.⁸ Nevertheless, this tripartite division proves futile when it comes to explain the most crucial aspect of DMs, namely which the reasons for their presence in texts are and, for the purpose of this paper, how their placement in certain positions can influence text organization and progression.

To answer these questions, two major epistemological issues must be settled. The first one concerns the scope of the concept of *position*, which

8 Cuenca (2006: 59) refers in this way to DMs such as *ara (bé)*, *és a dir*, *això és* and *o sigui*: “Si bé la mobilitat posicional és un del trets característics del connectors parentètics, cal tenir en compte que alguns només admeten la posició inicial respecte del segon membre de la connexió”. This is one of the reasons why the textual behavior of these parenthetical markers can be equated to the linking function of conjunctions: “el connector per excel·lència” (Cuenca, 2006: 46; cf. Llamas, 2010: 189). German DMs (specifically, RMs) such as *und zwar*, *beziehungsweise* or *das heißt* also have mobility restrictions and must always occupy the utterance-initial position, whereas others such as *genauer gesagt* or *mit einem Wort* still admit some degree of mobility (cf. Breindl *et al.*, 2014: 1133s; Robles, 2016: 73).

has quite often been applied indiscriminately to very diverse phenomena both of the sentence and the discourse levels (Montañez, 2015: 87). We will refer to the notion of *discourse position* as described by Montañez (2015: 88):

la posición puede entenderse en dos niveles: sintáctico y discursivo. La posición que ocupa un elemento será una noción sintáctica si se analiza respecto a unidades sintácticas, y será discursiva si se estudia dicho elemento en relación con unidades del discurso [...] En el caso de los MD, dado que sintácticamente son marginales, periféricos o extraoracionales y quedan fuera de la unidad gramatical oración, su posición se establece respecto a otro tipo de unidad, al enunciado o miembro del discurso. A esto nos referimos con *posición discursiva*.

The second major issue refers to the kinds of units with respect to which the position of a DM is to be defined.⁹ Since sentences (or clauses) can no longer be regarded as the minimal communication units of which texts are made up,¹⁰ it is compulsory to determine which other units can help us analyze the use of DMs and account for their functions in texts. The definition of these units cannot be based on grammatical features, but must rely on phenomena concerning the interactive aspects of communication. Only in this way it will be possible to properly analyze the processes that govern text construction and organization.

For this purpose, diverse models for discourse segmentation have been formulated in the last two decades (cf. Borreguero, 2014: 361; Pons, 2014b). All of them focus on utterances as the minimal units of communication and point to their illocutionary autonomy as their defining feature. In the present study, we follow the Basel model (Ferrari, 2014; Ferrari / Borreguero, 2015), in line with which a text consists of a set of “Unidades Comunicativas que están organizadas dentro de un sistema que supone diversas perspectivas semántico-pragmáticas” (Ferrari / Borreguero, 2015: 48). In this analysis, the key unit is the Communication Unit (henceforth, CU), which, when explicit, manifests itself in the form of the utterance. A CU

is characterised by the fact that it is the result of a communicative act having simultaneously an illocutionary force, within the meaning attributed by Austin, and a textual

9 Both position and unit are, actually, complementary notions in the study of DMs: “la posición, como orden de un elemento, se establece con respecto a otro en el seno de una unidad o grupo” (Montañez, 2015: 80). Their interdependence is shown by the fact that, in the same way that a DM takes a position with respect to the unit that contains it, the kind of unit also influences the textual function fulfilled by the DM (§ 4).

10 According to Halliday & Hasan (1976: 2), “a text does not CONSIST of sentences; it is REALIZED BY, or encoded in, sentences”.

composition function, which is defined in relation to the cotext (conclusion, explanation, reformulation, specification, addition, etc.). (Ferrari, 2014: 26)

The semantico-pragmatic content of a CU has a complex information structure, which must be analyzed in three different levels: (i) a level defining the presence and saliency of textual referents in the discursive memory; (ii) a topic-comment level; and (iii) a hierarchico-informational level, which articulates the CU into informationally autonomous and hierarchized information units (Ferrari, 2014: 37). For the purpose of our research, we will focus on this third dimension, that is to say, on the study of the articulation of texts into information units (henceforth, IU), “whose purpose is to group together and hierarchize the semantic content of the CU” (Ferrari, 2014: 26).

■ 4 The Basel model for utterance segmentation

From the point of view we adopt in this paper, communication must be understood as an intentional act with a definite purpose. Speakers construct their texts following strategies adapted to their aims (cf. Rath, 1979: 76; Antos, 1982: 91–99; Bührig, 1996: 79–80) and use their metapragmatic consciousness to select the formulation that better adjusts to the effect they want to achieve (Portolés, 2004: 27). The choices made by speakers do not just concern the grammar (syntax, morphology) and vocabulary they use in their utterances to construct propositional content. They also refer to how this content is sequenced and distributed in the IUs of which these utterances (and, therefore, the text) are made up. The organization of propositional meaning is never arbitrary, since it accommodates to the strategy designed by the speaker in view of the recipient’s expectations. As Portolés (2010: 283–284) remarks,

Los seres humanos organizamos el discurso de forma que se acomode a los conocimientos contextuales de nuestros interlocutores en el momento de la enunciación [...] Dicho con otras palabras, los hablantes al organizar un discurso no sólo tenemos en cuenta aquello que queremos comunicar, sino también los estados mentales que prevenimos en nuestros interlocutores, si desconocen –pongamos por caso– lo que les vamos a contar, si tienen una noticia previa o si se han hecho una idea equivocada de lo que, en realidad, ha sucedido.

Thus, a speaker not only provides his interlocutors with the amount of information that they need at each moment of the communication process; he also does it in a way that proves the most convenient for his purposes.

He organizes the data that he wants to present and arranges them in text as a sequence of information blocks. To help his interlocutors interpret the relevance of each block for text progression, the speaker resorts to different devices with which he establishes grammatical cohesion as well as informational hierarchy.

In line with this, the Basel model for text segmentation considers that the structuring unit of the utterance is the IU (Ferrari / Borreguero, 2015: 59). An utterance may contain a single IU or be composed of several IUs; in the latter case, the IUs create a hierarchy in which the unit known as the *nucleus* is placed in the foreground: “it is the Nucleus that defines the illocutionary force and the textual function of the Utterance that contains it” (Ferrari, 2014: 38). This nucleus may be accompanied by two units belonging to the informational background of the utterance: “the Frame, which precedes the Nucleus, and the Appendix, which accompanies Nucleus, Frame or also an Appendix in an inserted or consecutive position” (Ibid.). Both *frame* and *appendix* are informationally subordinate units “unable to take on the illocutionary force and textual function played by the Utterance as a whole (via the Nucleus)”.

The frame provides “the framework for the Nucleus by offering denotative content, propositional attitude content or procedural content” (Ibid.). In this way, the frame supplies the semantic coordinates for a truth-conditional interpretation or specifies “the illocutionary or textual (logical, thematic, polyphonic) *raison d'être* of the Nucleus”.

The appendix completes the content of the IU (nucleus, frame or appendix) to which it is attached. For this, it provides *a posteriori* or *in media res* indications of semantico-denotative, illocutionary or textual relevance. Unlike the nucleus, the appendix provides instructions with a local textual scope and, thus, has no direct impact on the semantico-pragmatic progression of the utterance (Ferrari, 2014: 49).

- (3) Es soll ein Solidarmodell sein, genauso wie beim geplanten Semesterticket. // / *Das heißt*, /^{Frame} / jeder Student bezahlt, /^{Nucleus} unabhängig davon, ob er es nutzt oder nicht. /^{Appendix} //¹¹ (*Nürnberger Zeitung* 21.05.2014)
- (4) Aquest any, a més dels contactes iniciats l'any passat, hi haurà una representació de directors soviètics. // / Com Jean Renoir, /^{Frame} jo també crec en l'organització horitzontal del món, /^{Nucleus} *és a dir* que

11 In the Basel model, CUs are separated by a double slash, and IUs by a single slash.

un fuster de Tailàndia s'entendrà perfectament amb un Fuster d'Islàndia. /Appendix // El mateix passa amb els pintors, amb els escriptors i amb els cineastes. (*Setze* 1988)

Let us now consider how this model can be applied to the description of RMs for the purpose of this study. A few preliminary specifications must be made regarding the three kinds of IUs identified by the Basel group and their relevance for the analysis of RMs. First, RMs can only appear in subordinate IUs; in other words, they cannot take the nuclear unit on their own, since they are unable to convey the propositional meaning necessary to express an illocutionary act. This makes them different from other DMs that can be used in the same way as holophrases and, thus, constitute an utterance by themselves.¹² Second, according to the Basel authors, both frame and appendix provide “background information, in the sense that it is not directly responsible for the communicative act performed by the Utterance” (De Cesare / Borreguero, 2014: 74–75). However, as will be seen below, RMs saturating the frame unit do not just link the nuclear information of their utterance to the preceding co-text, but very often they are the only clue for the recipient to recognize its illocutionary force.¹³ Third, next to the IUs mentioned above, the Basel model identifies the *comment* (i.e. a parenthetical construction) as an autonomous CU inside the utterance that is endowed with its own illocution. The distinction between the appendix and the comment often proves irrelevant for the study of RMs irrespective of whether it is made on the grounds of punctuation or of argumentative orientation. For this reason, we will refer to all IUs attached to or inserted into other IUs as appendixes.

■ 4.1 *Das heißt* and *és a dir* in the frame unit

A reformulation always sets up a relation of cohesion between two discourse elements (words, complex phrases, clauses, sentences or paragraphs) (Garcés, 2008: 76; Robles, 2012: 167). When these elements have the status of utterances, the RM tends to take the initial position of the second member (cf. Onea / Volodina, 2009: 295; Breindl *et al.*, 2014:

12 See, for example, De Cesare & Borreguero's (2014: 73–74) reflections on the operators *it. anche*, *fr. aussi* and *sp. también* in the nuclear unit “with no additional linguistic material”.

13 As posed by Ferrari & Borreguero (2015: 139): “la creación de un Marco es un modo para explicitar un contenido como trasfondo sobre el que el Núcleo asume su específico valor pragmático”.

1142), thus generating what Portolés (2007: 30) and Llopis (2016: 241) call a sort of text deixis (cf. Breindl *et al.*, 2014: 1132). The RM links the new utterance to the previous one, while specifying the semantic relation between them.

The RM in the frame unit provides three kinds of instructions for the recipient of the text: first, it presents the new CU (in other words, the utterance it initiates) as the continuation of a previous CU, which becomes partially or totally replaced by it. Second, it specifies in which way the propositional content of the second CU has to be understood with relation to the first CU (as an explanation, an identification of a textual reference, a specification, a correction, an illustration or a summary of it). And third, it introduces the second part of the reformulation as the nucleus of the new utterance. In doing so, it foregrounds its propositional content and presents it as a relevant issue for the argumentation developed in the text. In this sense, both *das heißt* and *és a dir* function somewhat like focus particles.

- (5) Soldaten sind keine Mörder. Jedenfalls nicht in einem Land, dessen Armee keine Angriffskriege führen darf. So steht es im Grundgesetz der Bundesrepublik. // / *Das heißt*: /^{Frame} Unseren Soldaten sind nur Verteidigungs- und Friedenseinsätze erlaubt. /^{Nucleus} // (*Die Zeit* 01.05.2014)
- (6) “A Guatemala mana l'exèrcit”, va dir ahir a Madrid el cap guerriller Rodrigo Asturias. // / *És a dir*, /^{Frame} no mana Cerezo i sí els EUA. /^{Nucleus} // (*Diari de Barcelona* 1987)

The focal function of these two RMs becomes especially manifest when they are used to introduce the summary of the propositional content presented in the previous utterances. In such case, the new formulation does not just gather and encapsulate prior information; it is also the culmination of a chain of data leading to a conclusion. For this reason, it is not unusual to find RM in this position in written argumentative texts¹⁴ introducing the (subjective) conclusion to which the speaker wants to lead his interlocutors.

- (7) Die Menschen im Wissenschaftsbetrieb sollen ihr Leben nach der Laufzeit von Forschungsprojekten und Fördermitteln richten. Das ist unwürdig– und es kann nicht funktionieren: Gute Wissenschaft braucht gute Arbeitsbedingungen. // / *Das heißt*: /^{Frame} Dauerstellen

14 Many of the examples presented in this study come from newspaper opinion columns.

für Daueraufgaben und sichere Stellen während der Doktorarbeit oder Habilitation. /^{Nucleus} // (*Süddeutsche Zeitung* 09.06.2015)

- (8) Les obres literàries més traduïdes al castellà provenen de l'anglès, seguides de les del francès, l'alemany i l'italià. Per exemple, mentre que l'any 1982 es van traduir de l'anglès al castellà 3.863 obres, l'any passat la xifra va augmentar a 4.625. Però a la pregunta a Milagros del Corral, secretària de la Federació del Gremi d'Editors d'Espanya, de quantes obres es traduïen del castellà a altres idiomes, no va poder donar xifres, però va dir que “moltes menys”. // / *És a dir*, /^{Frame} els editors espanyols vénen a la fira del llibre de Frankfurt sobretot a comprar drets d'autor i en molta menys mesura a vendre. /^{Nucleus} // (*Diari de Barcelona* 1987)

Not all the typical functions of explicative RMs (Garcés, 2008: 113; Robles, 2012: 172) occur in this position (at least, in written texts). Next to recapitulations, *das heißt* and *és a dir* are commonly used to introduce explanations when they saturate the frame unit.

- (9) Die Kultusministerkonferenz legt die Termine für die Sommerferien für alle Bundesländer fest – und zwar immer über einen Zeitraum von sechs Jahren im Voraus. Um Staus, volle Züge und ausgebuchte Urlaubsquartiere zu vermeiden, nehmen 14 der 16 Länder an einem sogenannten rollierenden System teil. // /*Das heißt*, /^{Frame} der Beginn der sechswöchigen Sommerferien verschiebt sich von Jahr zu Jahr. /^{Nucleus} // (*Hannoversche Allgemeine* 12.06.2014)
- (10) La novel·la negra elimina problemes plantejant el mecanisme de manera directa. // /*És a dir*, /^{Frame} A ha d'aclarir X pels motius més insospitats i inversemblants. /^{Nucleus} // (*El Temps* 1986)

Operations such as definition, identification of a textual referent or metonymic denomination are scarcely found in the analyzed corpus.

■ 4.2 *Das heißt* and *és a dir* in the appendix unit

Like the frame, the appendix is a subordinate component that conveys background information. Unlike it, it has a very reduced scope¹⁵ and does

15 As Ferrari & Borreguero (2015: 150) remark, “donde la estructura global del Enunciado permite la elección, la presentación de una información como Apéndice puede responder justamente a la voluntad de circunscribir localmente sus efecto semántico-pragmáticos”.

not collaborate in guaranteeing the continuity and coherence of the text in the way a frame does.

From a communicative point of view, the Basel authors link the appendix unit to two crucial operations: “Firstly, it may be exploited for modalising and correcting content in the Utterance without, however, modifying the balance of the text” (Ferrari, 2014: 49). With regard to the use of RMs in the appendix unit, this becomes especially manifest when the appendix attaches to a frame or to the nuclear element that functions as the topic of the utterance. In such case, the creation of an appendix generates a well-delimited hierarchical structure that allows the speaker to introduce necessary information without adding syntactic complexity to the sentence (Ferrari / Borreguero, 2015: 152).

- (11) // / Sämtliche Jubiläumsfahrer, /^{Nucleus-} *d. h.* alle, welche das Iron Bike Race bereits zum zehnten Mal absolviert haben, /^{Appendix} werden speziell geehrt werden. /^{-Nucleus} // (*Die Südschweiz* 22.09.2006)
- (12) // / Els de dalt, /^{Nucleus-} *és a dir*, els que paguen, /^{Appendix} no donen l’abast, /^{Nucleus} i molt menys quan hi ha persones que es dediquen a pidolar el poc que tenen. /^{Appendix} // (*Pa de Cera* 1985)

And, “secondly, the choice of Appendix is an ideal strategy for ensuring [...] that the reader has fully understood the content of the Utterance” (Ferrari, 2014: 49). This operation can assist a lexical understanding or an encyclopedic understanding, as in (13–14), where the speaker recalls certain denotative information that may not be present in the mind of the recipient.

- (13) // / Manche Proteine /^{Nucleus-} (Eiweiße) /^{Appendix} denaturieren bei 40 Grad Celsius, /^{-Nucleus} *das heißt*, sie verändern ihre Struktur. /^{Appendix} // (*Mannheimer Morgen* 22.11.2008)
- (14) // / La paraula làser és l’acrònim de l’expressió anglesa “Light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation”, /^{Nucleus} *és a dir*, l’amplificació de la llum mitjançant l’emissió estimulada de radiacions. /^{Appendix} // (*Avui* 1988)

These two functions can be fulfilled by appendixes introduced by a RM in any utterance position. However, it is characteristic that long reformulated segments appear in the right margin of the utterance, rather than attached to the frame or inserted into the nucleus.

- (15) // / Die AUA ist ein klassischer Hub-Carrier, /^{Nucleus} *das heißt*, sie bedient von einem Punkt aus ihr Streckennetz und nimmt dort auch eigene Umsteiger sowie jene von Partner-Airlines auf. /^{Appendix} // (*Die Presse* 04.12.2014)
- (16) // / L'Abedul és un restaurant de cuina natural, /^{Nucleus} *és a dir*, de carns a la brasa i amb salses de pebre verd o de roquefort, de peixos blancs a la basca, al forn o a la marinera, /^{Appendix1} i de no gaires complicacions. /^{Appendix2} // (*Anni* 1988)

When an appendix opened by a RM attaches to the frame of the utterance, it adds further information about the instructions contained in it.¹⁶ This can be done in two ways: either the appendix identifies a textual referent or it restricts the validity of the circumstances expressed by the frame, as in the following examples:

- (17) // / Was die Einführung des Abiturs nach zwölf Jahren betrifft, /^{Frame} *d.h.* genauer die KMK-gemäße Einführung des Abiturs nach zwölf Schuljahren nach Auslaufen der Übergangsbestimmung für die neuen Bundesländer, /^{Appendix} so gibt es in der Sache keinen Unterschied zwischen den Vorstellungen der Landesregierung und dem Gesetzentwurf der CDU. /^{Nucleus} // (*Sitzungsprotokoll Landtag Mecklenburg-Vorpommern* 28.06.2001)
- (18) // / Cada dia que passa amb el boicot pràctic dels Estats Units cap a Contadora, /^{Frame} *és a dir*, cap a al solució del diàleg, /^{Appendix} el tema de Nicaragua resta més bloquejat. /^{Nucleus} // (*El Temps* 1986)

Here, the presence of the RM points out that the content of the appendix has to be interpreted as background, secondary data with respect to the main line of the progression of the text, that is to say, it is not part of its main pillar information (cf. De Cesare / Borroguero, 2014: 80).

An appendix opened by a RM can also be connected (either inserted into or attached) to the nucleus of the utterance. The samples we have

16 A frame saturated by a RM cannot take an appendix due to its lack of propositional meaning. When such frame is followed by another IU not corresponding to the nucleus, we must conclude that the CU hosts two coordinated frames. See, for example: “La nit del 9 de juliol de 1884, es va produir un incendi que, a més d’altres danys, va reduir a cendres seixanta-dues banderes. // / *Es a dir*, /^{Frame1} segons l’esmentat Jaume Torrents, /^{Frame2} el foc va destruir les nostres banderes.” /^{Nucleus} // (*Vexil·la Catalana* 1985)

collected seem to suggest that the placement of such an appendix within the nucleus or after it does not necessarily correlate with the length of the reformulated segment; it is also related to the newness of the information introduced by the RM.¹⁷ Thus, reformulations placed inside the nucleus of an utterance tend to have a more restricted scope and do not contribute to the dynamics of text progression.

- (19) // / 90 Prozent aller Pfänder werden binnen kurzer Zeit /^{Nucleus-} *das heißt* meistens innerhalb von vier Monaten – /^{Appendix} wieder eingelöst. /^{-Nucleus} // (*Mannheimer Morgen* 20.12.2008)
- (20) // / Denn dort, /^{Nucleus-} *das heißt* in der aus Geldmangel geschlossenen türkischen Bibliothek, /^{Appendix} wird am 27. August eine Ausstellung mit türkischen und deutschen Künstlern eröffnet. /^{-Nucleus} // (*Die Tageszeitung* 29.07.2004)
- (21) // / La necessitat de col·laboració i el fet que fins gairebé els divuit anys la miopia no és estable /^{Nucleus-} *–és a dir* que pot continuar augmentant– /^{Appendix} fan que aquesta només sigui una operació possible en persones de més de divuit o vint anys. /^{-Nucleus} // (*Avui* 1988)

On the contrary, reformulations following the nucleus usually convey information that the recipient probably cannot derive from the content of the previous IUs.¹⁸ Appendixes in this position can express relevant indications for the interpretation of the transition to the next CU or, even, to host focused discourse segments (§ 4.1).

- (22) // / Angespornt durch die guten Rückmeldungen /^{Frame} möchte die Projektgruppe ihr Programm auch tageweise anbieten, /^{Nucleus} *das heißt* als Ausflugsprogramm für Schulen der Umgebung. /^{Appendix} // (*Niederösterreichische Nachrichten* 17.07.2014)
- (23) // / Funciona perquè les dues parts posen bona voluntat perquè funcioni, /^{Nucleus} *és a dir*, per salvar l'obstacle que representen les diferències de cultura i mentalitat. /^{Appendix} // (*Avui* 1988)

17 However, this is just a preliminary conclusion, which will need further supporting evidence.

18 Ferrari & Borreguero (2015: 154) also support this idea by stating that “cuando el Apéndice está vinculado a un Núcleo, el paso de la posición intercalada a la posición adyacente al final del Enunciado se traduce [...] en un incremento de su dinamismo comunicativo?”.

Finally, an appendix initiated by a RM can be attached to another appendix. In such case, the second appendix provides a further specification of the content of the first one and facilitates its interpretation.

- (24) // / Alle drei Namen sind -hêm-Namen /^{Nucleus}(niederdeutsch für Heim, /^{Appendix} *d.b.* „Siedlung“). /^{Appendix} // (*Braunschweiger Zeitung* 04.01.2013)
- (25) // / Jo, /^{Nucleus}- des que escric als diaris, /^{Appendix} / *és a dir*, ara farà deu anys, /^{Appendix} aquest poder només l'he exercit una vegada contra una pel·lícula espanyola. /^{-Nucleus} // (*Setze* 1988)

The use of two concatenated appendixes can generate very elaborate textual structures. In this way, the willingness of the speaker to direct his interlocutors to certain conclusions becomes manifest. All in all, this seems to be the least frequent position for appendixes containing RMs, since very few of the utterances that we have examined host such structures.

- (26) // / Sie waren von der Ausstattung beeindruckt, /^{Nucleus} insbesondere aber von den “kleinen” Klassen, /^{Appendix} *das heißt* 30 Schüler hier in Deutschland gegenüber etwa 50 Schülern in China. /^{Appendix} // (*Mannheimer Morgen* 25.08.2004)

■ 5 Conclusions

In the introduction to this paper, we stated that the distribution and organization of information in utterances cannot be seen as a subsidiary aspect of the use of DMs in texts (especially with regard to written discourse). Through the reflections provided in sections 2 and 3 and the analysis of *das heißt* and *és a dir* presented in section 4, we have offered evidence for the fact that a comprehensive account of DMs must include a level of linguistic structuring that goes beyond grammar. In this sense, the Basel model for discourse segmentation has proved valid for the purpose of explaining reformulation as an information packaging mechanism. Reformulations allow speakers to sequence the propositional content of their utterances and present it as a set of hierarchically organized information units.

This study has produced preliminary results that a major research will have to confirm. However, some first conclusions can be drawn about the benefits of using a model of discourse units for the description of DMs

and about the validity of the Basel model for the contrastive analysis of RMs in a Germanic and a Romance language:

1. The definition of text as a pragmatic entity consisting of communicative units forces us to search for motivations for the use of DMs other than the ones described by linguistic analyses based on grammatical relations.

2. Whereas reformulation can be satisfactorily described as a self-repair mechanism in spoken language, its use in written discourse is better defined as an information packaging mechanism through which a speaker distributes the propositional content of his utterances and organizes it hierarchically into two informative levels.

3. The IUs described by the Basel model prove valid for the segmentation of discourse for the purpose of this research. Reformulations are always found in informatively subordinate segments that remain outside the utterance core structure and provide instructions for the interpretation of the main pillar information. The instructions expressed by the IUs frame and appendix do not just differ in content but also in scope.

4. The kind of IU on which a RM operates and its position inside or next to it seems to have an influence on the metalinguistic functions fulfilled by the RM. From the evidence collected, it cannot be definitely established if certain functions correlate with specific positions. It is manifest, though, that the presence of *das heißt* and *és a dir* in the frame unit favors an argumentative (conclusive) interpretation of the segment it initiates and characterizes it as especially relevant for text progression. Furthermore, metalinguistic functions such as defining, specifying a textual referent or illustrating seem to be more frequent in the appendix unit than in the frame.

5. The position of an appendix initiated by a RM with respect to the IU to which it attaches does not just correlate with its more or less reduced scope. It also seems to provide clues about the block of information it precedes in terms of its newness and expectability.

All in all, our findings show some tendencies that will have to be confirmed by further empirical evidence. For that reason, we stick to Borreguero's (2014) understanding of the loose relation between DMs, utterance position and discourse function:

We do not presuppose that position determines function because we do not believe that strict determination relationships rule language structure. We only suggest that a particular position favors the development of certain discourse functions, because different positions in the Utterance have different scopes and this difference in scope contributes to the acquisition and consolidation of certain functions. (Borreguero, 2014: 361) ■

■ Bibliography

- Altmann, Hans (1981): *Formen der Herausstellung im Deutschen*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- / Hofmann, Ute (2008): *Topologie fürs Examen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Antos, Gerd (1982): *Grundlagen einer Theorie des Formulierens*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Auer, Peter (1997): «Formen und Funktionen der Vor-Vorfeldbesetzung im gesprochenen Deutsch», in: Schlobinski, Peter (ed.): *Syntax des gesprochenen Deutsch*, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 55–91.
- (2006): «Increments and more. Anmerkungen zur augenblicklichen Diskussion über die Erweiterbarkeit von Turnkonstruktionseinheiten», in: Deppermann, Arnulf *et al.* (eds.): *Grammatik und Interaktion*, Tübingen: Narr, 279–294.
- / Günthner, Susanne (2005): «Die Entstehung von Diskursmarkern im Deutschen: ein Fall von Grammatikalisierung?», in: Leuschner, Torsten *et al.* (eds.): *Grammatikalisierung im Deutschen*, Berlin / New York: de Gruyter, 335–362.
- Averintseva, Maria (2007): «Links und rechts vom Satz: Satzperipherien im Deutschen und ihre Rolle im Diskurs», in: Tarvas, Mari *et al.* (eds.): *Linguistik und Didaktik*, Tallin: TLÜ Kirjastus, 141–153.
- (2009): *Rechte Satzperipherie im Diskurs: die NP-Rechtsversetzung im Deutschen*, Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Bach, Carme (2017, in press): «Les marqueurs de reformulation paraphrastique du catalan: une classe homogène», *Pragmalingüística* 25.
- Borreguero, Margarita (2014): «Left periphery in discourse. Frame units and discourse markers», in: Dufter, Andreas / de Toledo, Álvaro (eds.): *Left sentence peripheries in Spanish*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 345–382.
- Breindl, Eva *et al.* (2014): *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren*, v. 2, Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter.
- Brinton, Laurel J. (1996): *Pragmatic markers in English: grammaticalization and discourse functions*, Berlin / New York: de Gruyter.
- Bührig, Kristin (1996): *Reformulierende Handlungen*, Tübingen: Narr.

- Chafe, Wallace (1976): «Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view», in: Li, Charles (ed.): *Subject and topic*, New York: Academic Press, 25–56.
- Cuenca, M. Josep (2006): *La connexió i els connectors*, Vic: Eumo.
- (2017): «Connectors gramaticals i connectors lèxics en la construcció discursiva del debat parlamentari», *Zeitschrift für Katalanistik* 30, 99–121.
- Dalmas, Martine (1993): «Nachgestelltes in der deutschen Verbalgruppe», in: Marillier, Jean-François (ed.): *Satzanfang-Satzende*, Tübingen: Narr, 205–218.
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria / Borreguero, Margarita (2014): «The contribution fo the Basel model to the description of polyfunctional discourse markers», in Pons (ed.), 55–94.
- Del Saz, Milagros (2007): *English discourse markers of reformulation*, Bern: Lang.
- Diedrichsen, Elke (2017): «Pleonasm in particle verb constructions in German», in: Nolan, Brian / Diedrichsen, Elke (eds.): *Argument realisation in complex predicates and complex events*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 43–77.
- Estellés, Maria (2011): *Gramaticalización y paradigmas*, Frankfurt a. M.: Lang.
- Ferrari, Angela (2014): «The Basel model for paragraph segmentation», in Pons (ed.), 23–53.
- / Borreguero, Margarita (2015): *La interfaz lengua-texto. Un modelo de estructura informativa*, Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Fiehler, Reinhard (2004): *Eigenschaften gesprochener Sprache*, Tübingen: Narr.
- Finegan, Edward (2015): *Language. Its structure and use*, Stamford: Cengage.
- Fraser, Bruce (1996): «Pragmatic markers», *Pragmatics* 6, 167–190.
- Garcés, M. Pilar (2008): *La organización del discurso: marcadores de ordenación y de reformulación*, Madrid / Frankfurt: Iberoamericana / Vervuert.
- Gohl, Christine / Günthner, Susanne (1999): «Grammatikalisierung von weil als Diskursmarker in der gesprochenen Sprache», *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 18, 39–75.
- Halliday, M.A.K. / Hasan, Ruqaiya (1976): *Cohesion in English*, London / New York: Longman.
- Imo, Wolfgang (2012): «Wortart Diskursmarker?», in: Rothstein, Björn (ed.): *Nicht-flektierende Wortarten*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 48–88.
- (2013): *Sprache in Interaktion*, Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter.

- Institut d'Estudis Catalans (ed.): «Corpus Textual Informatitzat de la Llengua Catalana» (CTILC), <<http://ctilc.iec.cat>> [28.02.2017].
- Institut für Deutsche Sprache (ed.): «Deutsches Referenzkorpus» (DeReKo), <<https://cosmas2.ids-mannheim.de>> [28.02.2017].
- Krifka, Manfred / Musan, Renate (2012): «Information structure: overview and linguistic issues», in: Krifka, Manfred / Musan, Renate (eds.): *The expression of information structure*, Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter, 1–43.
- Lambrecht, Knud (1994): *Information structure and sentence form*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2001): «Dislocation», in: Haspelmath, Martin (ed.): *Language typology and language universals*, v. 2, Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter, 1050–1078.
- Lehmann, Christian (2008): «Information structure and grammaticalization», in: Seoane, Elena / López, M. José (eds.): *Theoretical and empirical issues in grammaticalization*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 207–229.
- Llamas, Carmen (2010): «Los marcadores del discurso y su sintaxis», in Loureda / Acín (eds.), 183–239.
- Llopis, Ana (2016): «Significado y funciones de los marcadores discursivos», *Verba* 43, 227–264.
- Loureda, Óscar / Acín, Esperanza (eds.) (2010): *Los estudios sobre marcadores del discurso en español, hoy*, Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Martín Zorraquino, M. Antonia (1994): «Gramática del discurso. Los llamados marcadores del discurso», in: *Actas del congreso de la lengua española. Sevilla 7–10.10.1992*, Madrid: Instituto Cervantes, 709–720.
- (2008): «Los marcadores del discurso desde el punto de vista gramatical», in: Martín Zorraquino, M. Antonia / Montolío, Estrella (eds.): *Los marcadores del discurso. Teoría y análisis*, Madrid: Arco Libros, 19–53.
- / Portolés, José (1999): «Los marcadores del discurso», in: Bosque, Ignacio / Demonte, Violeta (eds.): *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, v. 3, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 4051–4213.
- Meyer-Hermann, Reinhard (1976): «Metakommunikation», *Linguistik und Didaktik* 7, 83–86.
- Montañez, Marta (2015): *Marcadores discursivos conversacionales y posición final*, València: Universitat de València.
- Montolío, Estrella (2008): *Conectores de la lengua escrita*, Barcelona: Ariel.
- Onea, Edgar / Volodina, Anna (2009): «Der Schein trägt nämlich», *Linguistische Berichte* 219, 291–321.

- Pasch, Renate *et al.* (2003): *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren*, Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter.
- Pons, Salvador (ed.) (2014a): *Discourse segmentation in Romance languages*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- (2014b): «Models of discourse segmentation in Romance languages», in Pons (ed.), 1–21.
- Portolés, José (2004): *Pragmática para hispanistas*, Madrid: Síntesis.
- (2007): *Marcadores del discurso*, Barcelona: Ariel.
- (2010): «Los marcadores del discurso y la estructura informativa», in Loureda / Acín (eds.), 281–325.
- Rath, Rainer (1979): *Kommunikationspraxis*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Robles, Ferran (2012): «Los marcadores de reformulación alemanes: estudio preliminar», *Revista de Filología Alemana* 20, 159–179.
- (2016): «Metadiskurs und Phraseologie: phrasale Formulierungsmarker im Deutschen und Katalanischen», *Zeitschrift für Katalanistik* 29, 59–79.
- Schwitalla, Johannes (2012): *Gesprochenes Deutsch*, Berlin: Schmidt.
- Selting, Margret (1994): «Konstruktionen am Satzrand interaktive Ressource in natürlichen Gesprächen», in: Haftka, Brigitta (ed.): *Was determiniert Wortstellungsvariation?*, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 299–318.
- Thim-Mabrey, Christiane (1988): «Satzadverbialia und andere Ausdrücke im Vorvorfeld», *Deutsche Sprache* 16, 52–67.
- Vinckel, Hélène (2006): *Die diskursstrategische Bedeutung des Nachfelds im Deutschen*, Wiesbaden: DUV.
- Wöllstein, Angelika (2010): *Topologisches Satzmodell*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Zifonun, Gisela *et al.* (1997): *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, v. 2, Berlin: de Gruyter.

■ Ferran Robles i Sabater, Universitat de València, Institut Interuniversitari de Llengües Modernes Aplicades / Departament de Filologia anglesa i Alemanya, Avda. Blasco Ibáñez, 32, E-46010 València, <ferran.robles@uv.es>.